REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claim Rejections -35 usc § 103

Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Storm et al. (US Patent 6,016,312) in view of Yu et al. (US Patent 6,735,454).

Applicants traverse the rejection of Claims 1 and 16, as presented. There is no suggestion to combine the two references. Storm does not have any statement about needing to adjust further, such as for frequency drift; in fact Storm is satisfied that his algorithm already provides good results "the clock edge synchronizer 202 removes the CDMA radiotelephone from the low power sleep mode substantially synchronized with system timing" (Col 5 L65-67). Since Storm's method is already in a substantially synchronized state, there is no reason to add further steps. Similarly, Yu states (Col 4, L44 – 46) "the active-mode clock is activated at a wake-up time closely in synchronization with a next paging slot"; so Yu also has an algorithm that effected synchronization without the need for further steps. Therefore, there is no motivation to combine the inventions of the two references; and neither reference individually anticipates nor suggests the elements of Claim 1 and 16.

Moreover, Claim 1 (currently amended) recites "modifying the system timing by a ratio" and the "ratio is adjusted for frequency drift". Support for the latter is given on p. 7, line 11 of the disclosure, for example. Neither Storm's, nor Yu's inventions operate based on this ratio. Storm Col 6 L1- 6 does not teach nor suggest "modifying the system timing by a ratio" as alleged by the Examiner. A similar argument may be made for the "ratios" recited in Claim 16. For example, Yu does not disclose "measuring sleep clock frequency using an initial ratio" as alleged by the Examiner. So, for at least these further reasons, Claims 1 and 16 are not anticipated by Storm or Yu, and therefore should be allowable.

Claims 2, 4, 5 being dependent on Claim 1 (currently amended) should also be allowable for the at least same foregoing reasons.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 6-15, 17-26, 27-45 were allowed.   Applicants thank the Examiner.

New Claims

New Claim 46 recites elements which are not taught nor suggested by either Storm or Yu. For example, neither of them attempt to correct for both types of errors: "ratio is adjusted for frequency drift" and "for quantization error".   New Claim 47 recites "applying an IIR filter to a current and a previous value of the ratio, whereby an error in the ratio is smoothed out" which is not anticipated nor suggested by the references. Therefore, Claims 46 and 47 should be patentable over the cited references.   New Claim 48 combines the elements of Claims 46 and 47 and therefore should also be allowable for the at least same foregoing reasons.

New Claim 49 recites elements which are not taught nor suggested by either Storm or Yu. For example, neither reference adjusts for both "frequency drift" and "quantization error" as recited in Claim 49. And neither anticipates "reducing a quantization error in the initial ratio by averaging both edges of the reference clock". Therefore, the amended Claim 49 should be patentable over the cited references.

Respectful request is made for reconsideration of the application, as amended, and for an issuance of a Notice of Allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

/Ronald O. Neerings/
Ronald O. Neerings
Reg. No. 34,227
Texas Instruments Incorporated
PO Box 655474, M/S 3999
Dallas, Texas 75265
972.917.5299